REMARKS

Status of the Claims

The final Office Action mailed January 11, 2010 noted that claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 7-10 were pending and rejected all claims. Claim 1 is amended. Claims 4, 5 and 7-10 are cancelled. New claims 11-16 are added. No new matter is believed to be presented.

It is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 2 and 11-16 are pending and under consideration. A Request for Continued Examination is submitted herewith.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Office Action, on page 2, rejected claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 7-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pettersen and Kim. The Office Action, on page 15, rejected claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pettersen, Kim and Hawes. These rejections are respectfully traversed below.

Claims 4, 5 and 7-10 are cancelled.

The Office Action, on page 6, asserted that the features of claim 1 are obvious in view of the teachings of Pettersen and Kim. However, claim 1 is amended to clarify distinguishing features not discussed by Pettersen and Kim. Claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Petterson and Kim, taken alone and in combination, because nothing cited or found discusses "a contents information process portion that makes a storage portion store the determined dynamically-altered contents and the inputted parameter in association with a date and time of generation of the Web page, a screen ID identifying a generation of the Web page and user identifying information on the user," "a Web page regeneration portion that regenerates the Web page at a second time by incorporating therein the extracted contents of the Web page; and a regenerated Web page transmission portion that transmits the regenerated Web page to the terminal device of the administrator along with the parameter, the date and time of generation and the screen ID to allow the administrator to identify a cause of an error in the dynamically-altered contents."

Pettersen and Kim do not discuss generating a web page at a first time and regenerating at a second time as well as transmitting the parameter, a date and time and a screen ID to an administrator to allow the administrator to identify a cause of an error of generation of the Web page. In fact, Pettersen and Kim do not contemplate solving such a problem and do not discuss identifying an error in dynamically-altered contents. Rather, Kim merely discusses accepting input from a user (See Kim, paragraphs [0040]-[0044]) and Pettersen discusses inserting

dynamic web content into a web page based on dynamic content codes or tags embedded in the web page and displaying the dynamic content. (See Pettersen, for example, column 4, lines 29-48). Pettersen also discusses that the dynamic content may be dynamically rearranged or regenerated, for example, an advertisement. (See Pettersen, column 11, lines 28-39).

Additionally, nothing cited or found in Hawes cures the deficiencies of Pettersen and Kim discussed above. Hawes discusses retrieving content from web pages by caching certain content and not caching other content and using a timer to retrieve the content which is not cached. For example, while images may be cached, other portions of a web page may have changed and need to be re-retrieved and thus are not cached. (See Hawes, Abstract and column 5, lines 9-37). Hawes, in combination with Pettersen and Kim does not discuss "a regenerated Web page transmission portion that transmits the regenerated Web page to the terminal device of the administrator along with the parameter, the date and time of generation and the screen ID to allow the administrator to identify a cause of an error in the dynamically-altered contents."

Claim 2 depends on claim 1 and patentably distinguishes over Pettersen, Kim and Hawes for at least the reasons discussed above.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

New Claims 11-16

New claim 11 patentably distinguishes over Pettersen, Kim and Hawes, taken alone and in combination, because nothing cited or found discusses "generating, by the computer, a web page having dynamically altered web content at a first time based on the parameter and the web page information" as well as "receiving, by the computer, from an administrator at least one of the parameter, date and time when the dynamically altered web content was obtained, and a screen ID identifying the web page; regenerating, by the computer, the web page having the dynamically altered web contents at a second time based on said at least one of the parameter, the date and time, and the screen ID; and transmitting, by the computer, the web page having the dynamically altered web content that is regenerated to a terminal device of an administrator for the administrator to identify a cause of an error in the dynamically altered web content."

Pettersen discusses a designated portion of a web page which has dynamic content which may be inserted and is based on dynamic content host server code embedded in the web page. (See Pettersen, for example, column 4, lines 29-48). Kim discusses a method realizing a personal shop which utilizes a web server to request user information which is inputted and

stored in a database. (See Kim, for example, paragraph [0040]). On the contrary, claim 1 is related to generating a web page at a first time based on a parameter and regenerating the web page at a second time based on the parameter, the date and time and the screen ID. This allows the administrator to identify a cause of error in the dynamically altered web content. Both Pettersen and Kim do not discuss generating a web page at a first time and a second time and allowing the administrator to identify a cause of error in the dynamically altered web contents.

New claim 14 patentably distinguishes over Pettersen, Kim and Hawes, taken alone and in combination, because nothing cited or found discusses "generating a web page having dynamically altered web content at a first time based on the parameter and the web page information," as well as "receiving from a terminal of an administrator at least one of the parameter, date and time when the dynamically altered web contents was obtained, and a screen ID identifying the web page; regenerating the web page having the dynamically altered web content at a second time based on said at least one of the parameter, the date and time, and the screen ID; and transmitting the web page having the dynamically altered web contents that is regenerated to a terminal device of an administrator for the administrator to identify a cause of an error in the dynamically altered web content."

The dependent claims depend from the above-discussed independent claims and are patentable over the cited references for the reasons discussed above. The dependent claims also recite additional features not taught or suggested by the cited references. For example, claim 12 recites "storing, into a storage portion provided for the computer, as a log file, the dynamically altered web content, the parameter, the date and time, the screen ID in association with each another." In particular, although Kim discusses a database and storing user information in the database about a user membership, Kim does not discuss storing the dynamically altered content, the parameter, the date and time, and the screen ID in association with each other. It is submitted that the dependent claims are independently patentable over the cited references.

Summary

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 4-12-10

y: _____lohn R Bedna

Registration No. 62,168

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor

Washington, D.C. 20005 Telephone: (202) 434-1500 Facsimile: (202) 434-1501